

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/480,836

Applicant(s)

Rohit C. L. Sachdeva

Examiner

Dave Ghatt

Group Art Unit

3307



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dave Ghatt(3) David Pritchard(2) Edgar Burr

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 20, 1997

MAILED

FEB 20 1997

GROUP 330

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claims 38-49. (attached to this paper)

Identification of prior art discussed:

US 5,066,224 (Block et al) and US 4,011,602 (Rybicki et al).

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The patentability of proposed claims 38-49 (faxed to Examiner Ghatt for the purposes of this interview) were discussed. Most of the discussion focused on the patentability of these proposed claims over the references of Block et al, and Rybicki et al. Mr Burr suggested changes to the proposed claims to make them patentably distinct from the two references discussed, however no guarantees were made for all claims. Furthermore Mr Pritchard was told the patentability of these claims could only be determined after a final updated search is performed. Mr Pritchard had also faxed in a copy of proposed drawings. Mr Burr pointed out a couple areas of the drawings that did not appear to be accurate. No final statement on the status of the drawings was given. Mr Pritchard was told that these drawings as well as the proposed claims must be checked to see if they are supported by the specification.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

EDGAR S. BURR
S.P.E.
GROUP ART UNIT 337

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.